



**MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
TOWN OF WARRENTON
June 25, 2015
7:00 P.M.**

The regular meeting of the Town of Warrenton Architectural Review Board (ARB) convened on June 25, 2015 at 7:00 PM in the Municipal Building.

Dr. Melissa Wiedenfeld, Chair, called the meeting to order and a quorum was determined. The following members were present: Mr. Steve Wojcik, Mr. Jay Tucker, Dr. Carole Hertz, and Mr. Jerry Wood. Ms. Sarah Sitterle, Director of Planning & Community Development and Ms. Kate Gibson, Planner, represented staff. Mr. Carter Nevill was not in attendance.

Purpose Statement

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the Purpose of the Architectural Review Board; Statement of Qualifications of Architectural Review Board to be: The Board makes a decision on applications in order to preserve the character of the Historic District of the Town of Warrenton on behalf of the Town of Warrenton. Decisions of the Board are based upon the Historic Guidelines and a decision for each application is made based upon its own merits. Those decisions do not constitute precedence for any future decisions.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Wood noted that on page 4 the last sentence of paragraph 12 should read the height of the BMW sign, from the ground, should be a minimum of eight feet. Dr. Wiedenfeld noted Page 7 only reflected the status of her vote for adding COA15-12 to the agenda. She suggested minutes be revised to state all other members voted in favor. Mr. Tucker made motion to approve the minutes with noted revisions, Dr. Hertz seconded the motion, and the motion passed. All voted in favor.

NEW BUSINESS

- A. Certificate of Appropriateness 15-11. Single family dwelling on the corner of Culpeper Street and East Shirley Avenue. Applicant is Mr. David Norden, Architect.**

Mr. Norden stated the owner was Mr. Marcus Bulmer who was ill and unable to attend. Mr. Norden stated that he had been given authority to represent Mr. Bulmer and conduct negotiations

accordingly. Mr. Norden directed the Board members to the site plan and indicated he had requested, to the Board of Zoning Appeals, a twenty-foot relief on the setback requirement, on Shirley Avenue, to save magnolia trees currently on the site. Without the exception, it would not be possible to save the trees. Mr. Norden identified revisions to the site plan with the garage on the opposite side and the front door entrance facing Culpeper Street and the magnolia trees that will be saved. He indicated the tall pine trees would serve as a great canopy over the site and give the site a mature feeling.

Mr. Norden stated that the house would be 1,600 square feet per floor not including the veranda, mud/laundry room and garage. The home will have a Greek Revival flavor in the details, which was requested by the homeowner. Mr. Norden stated the homeowner is also the builder.

Mr. Wood noted that Mr. Norden presented two homes at the BZA meeting, but here only one home was being presented.

Mr. Norden stated that there were two lots, but only one home was being developed and the second will be developed later.

Dr. Hertz asked how many acres there are in the entire parcel.

Mr. Norden stated he could not recall and was unable to locate information.

Dr. Hertz indicated it did not matter because it was not an ARB issue.

Mr. Norden stated the owner divided the parcel before he got involved and was planning to build on the second lot, but just not at this time.

Mr. Wood asked what the setback was from Culpeper Street.

Mr. Norden stated it was 40 feet from Culpeper and 40 feet from Shirley Avenue.

Mr. Tucker asked if the ARB could make any site adjustments relating to location and orientation of the house.

Mr. Norden stated Mr. Tucker was free to speak his mind but that there was not that much flexibility.

Mr. Tucker pointed out one of the statements in the staff report regarding the setback from the street being similar to other houses on Culpeper Street. He stated that was a misnomer because the garage is equally set back not the house. The house is actually 30 feet farther from the street than the other houses. He noted this was the only house whose garage setback is not equal to the house or behind the house. At this point, the ARB cannot request that the house be brought forward to the setback or the garage be moved behind the house because it is already a done deal with the Planning Commission and other entities. Doing this would in essence do what the staff report outlines and make this house similar to other houses on Culpeper Street. ARB has not had the opportunity to discuss setback issues or trees and as result, the Board cannot do much about the lay of the house on the land.

Mr. Norden identified easement issues on the plan that require the layout as he described.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Board was not aware of the easement issues and if the Board had been more involved earlier in the project that issue would have been addressed. Mr. Tucker stated the garage could have been located closer to Shirley Avenue to provide the required easement. He indicated if there was going to be an easement there would be pavement or driveway, but at this point ARB hands are tied. ARB was not part of that design process or submission process and as result, the site plan had to be accepted as it is.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated there was a trade off in trying to fit in with the trees.

Mr. Tucker stated ARB is unable to revise the site plan. If the Board had been involved earlier, discussions could have been held about leaving the easement clear, having the garage going forward, and having the house line up with the other houses on Culpeper Street. Mr. Tucker stressed the need for the Board to be aware of what is happening in the process of new construction.

Mr. Norden stated that he thought the yellow brick house on Culpeper Street was setback more than 40 feet but he did not have a plat.

Mr. Tucker showed some photographs he took of the other houses on Culpeper Street and with the exception of the immediate neighbor (yellow brick house), all are closer to the street. Mr. Tucker stated that the lack of ARB involvement in the site process prevents the Board from doing anything.

Mr. Norden stated the site plan was given to the Board as a courtesy to show what was being done to save trees.

Mr. Tucker asked if the house would have asphalt shingles.

Mr. Norden stated yes.

Mr. Tucker stated there was a discrepancy in the plan because it shows three-foot and eighteen-inch standing seam metal roofing in the first floor plan, on the garage and laundry room. He assumed that was an error.

Mr. Norden stated that it was not intended to represent metal roofing.

Discussion was held about the elevations of the plan and Mr. Tucker asked about the trim.

Mr. Norden stated it was both a trim detail and pilaster that stands forward of the house and is a two-part pilaster very much like a corner board. The wide part is a large corner board, and one-bys are applied to that corner board to give it depth. They are not represented on the plans because the plans are in small scale.

Mr. Tucker again went back to the photographs of the houses on Culpeper Street and pointed out

that none of them utilize six-over-six or six-over-nine windows, as are on the plans. There are two-over-two, one-over-one, and four-over-four. Mr. Tucker suggested that a different character be considered for the windows that are similar to neighboring houses. Mr. Tucker also noted that the plan identified the windows as aluminum with simulated divided light, and that again none of the neighboring houses have simulated divided lights and that none of the windows are aluminum. Mr. Tucker stated he felt the proposed design was too contemporary for the character of the house that is being presented. He suggested that the windows be true divided light and be wood instead of aluminum to go with what is in the neighborhood.

Mr. Tucker stated that there was one active chimney and one false chimney.

Mr. Norden stated the second chimney would be used for all of the plumbing vents so there are no vent stacks coming through the roof.

Mr. Tucker identified on the design drawing, an item on top of the chimney that he referred to as chimney pots and asked Mr. Norden what they were.

Mr. Norden stated it had not been selected at this point.

Dr. Hertz indicated she had no questions for the applicant.

Mr. Wojcik asked what material would be used for the cupola roof.

Mr. Norden stated it would be metal, or it could be copper if that is preferable. He stated that it is so high and shallow that it will not be seen from the street and as result, he did not think about putting it on the drawing.

Mr. Wojcik stated that on the east elevation and on the north elevation at the basement level the drawings show windows and he asked if some of them would be below ground and if there would be a retaining wall.

Mr. Norden stated there would be window wells.

Mr. Wojcik asked if the skylight would face Shirley Avenue.

Mr. Norden stated it would.

Mr. Wojcik stated that would make it visible from the street.

Mr. Norden stated if it could be seen through the pine trees that are being saved, then yes it would be visible from the street. Mr. Norden stated it would provide light for a bathroom located on the third floor.

Mr. Wojcik asked if it would be possible to relocate it to the other side so it was not visible from the street.

Mr. Norden stated that headroom would become an issue if the skylight was relocated. He

indicated it would be the only fresh air and daylight provided for that room. Mr. Norden stated it was a small skylight and he did not think it would be too obtrusive.

Mr. Tucker asked if the skylight was flat glass.

Mr. Norden stated yes.

Mr. Wojcik asked about the garage door materials.

Mr. Norden said it may be wood but that was a good question. He indicated that he has been concentrating more on the style, which will be carriage house style, and those are normally wood.

Mr. Norden stated the garage door would be an overhead type of garage door.

Mr. Wojcik stated that since the garage will be visible he suggested that it be wood or wood veneer.

Mr. Wojcik asked if the owner was building the home to sell or for it to be his residence.

Mr. Norden stated to sell.

Mr. Wood asked about the deck material.

Mr. Norden stated majority of the deck would be made of cedar and painted. It will not be built with pressure treated wood.

Mr. Wood stated that the window manufacturer was Anderson Windows and he agreed with Mr. Tucker's comments.

Mr. Wood recommended border trees be used and not pine trees.

Mr. Tucker stated he had concerns about the ivy growing on the existing trees as well as the growth on the trunks of the trees and he was going to question it but was not sure if ARB had jurisdiction to address property maintenance issues.

Mr. Wojcik asked about the specifications on the doors that will be facing Culpeper Street and Shirley Avenue.

Mr. Norden stated all the doors will be wood.

Dr. Hertz asked if the house will have HardiePlank siding.

Mr. Norden stated yes.

Dr. Hertz asked why the garage doors were not the same material.

Mr. Norden stated it was too heavy.

Mr. Tucker asked if a brand had been selected for the garage doors.

Mr. Norden stated no.

Mr. Wojcik asked Mr. Norden if he was amenable to the cupola roof being metal.

Mr. Norden stated yes.

Mr. Norden stated that the new revised ARB Guidelines state new construction roofs can be prefinished metal, which is once and forever done and costs less than copper.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked what the purpose of the cupola was.

Mr. Norden stated it was to bring light to the third floor.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked about air.

Mr. Norden stated the cupola would not provide air.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked about the stucco finish on the chimney. She indicated chimneys in the historic district were more ornate. She asked if the stucco finish was a concession to not recreate an historic structure.

Mr. Norden stated yes. He indicated the chimneys were for gas fireplaces, and he was trying to downplay the importance of the chimneys. They cannot be done in brick and the owner did not want them done in siding. Even though they are fake chimneys with gas flues coming through them, he thought stucco was the best material to use. Mr. Norden stated more could be done with the chimneys than what was represented in the drawings.

Dr. Wiedenfeld suggested a band around the top.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for staff report.

Ms. Gibson stated staff had reviewed setback and Zoning Ordinance requirements. She indicated the Historic District Guidelines require new construction be recognized as a product of its period of construction, design, materials and craftsmanship, and be consistent with the architecture in the Historic District. Ms. Gibson indicated the Board was provided a copy of the new construction guidelines and flexibility on the type of materials was allowed.

Dr. Wiedenfeld pointed out that the Guidelines state windows may have simulated divided sashes but true divided lights are encouraged. She stated that a motion could be made to encourage true divided lights.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that in terms of the structure reflecting modern design she did not think it would be considered an old structure when it was completed.

Mr. Tucker stated the Guidelines require construction be of the period and the proposed structure is a throwback to Greek Revival, which is not the style of 2015. It is mimicking a style of years ago.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated it was using elements that would be found on older buildings but it is clearly a new building.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the mature trees would help to shield the façade seen from Culpeper Street. She stated that this was also true for houses further out on Culpeper Street. She said she felt the side entrance to the garage helps soften the appearance because the garage door is not all that you see from Culpeper Street.

Mr. Tucker stated that the garage would be visible at the traffic light on Culpeper Street.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if there were plans for the large parking area.

Mr. Norden stated currently there was no definitive material plan and those were preliminary ideas on how they could do a parking court and sidewalk to the street.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated to get to the drive you will have to come into the side and come around the rear to park and to get into the garage you come into Culpeper Street and go past the garage and circle around. Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the layout was unusual layout but the sidewalk will allow public entrance.

Mr. Norden stated he hoped it would be used by the neighbors that come over to visit.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked for any further questions.

Mr. Tucker stated there are many materials other than the HardiePlank, HardiePlank trim and asphalt shingles that should be addressed, such as the garage doors and others where materials are not identified. He suggested a motion be made to address materials for the cupola, roof, garage doors, deck material and chimney detail.

Mr. Norden indicated windows were very important to the owner and asked for further clarification. As opposed to using wood, he indicated he had used simulated divided lights on historic structures and as result, he did not expect to go to true divided lights because of the expense and fewer options. Mr. Norden noted there are all kinds of windows on the street, they were not trying to copy the house next door, and he wanted to know the Board was okay with the light layout and aluminum material. Mr. Norden stated the owner went with aluminum clad because he will be selling the property and people do not want to paint windows.

Mr. Tucker stated that it appeared the owner was trying to develop a house that has a similar stature to other houses on Culpeper Street but he wants to use inferior materials. Mr. Tucker stated that in his opinion, simulated divided lights were not appropriate for Culpeper Street. If this house wants to be equal to the other homes on Culpeper Street, it needs to have true divided light windows whether they are six-over-six, nine-over-six, or whatever they are. This is not a

little cottage; it is going to be a three-story structure on Culpeper Street, one of the most prestigious streets in Warrenton. The owner plans to sell and let the owner deal with it, but the Board is here to protect the Town and the character of the neighborhood. Simulated divided lights do not provide that character.

Mr. Norden stated he had used simulated divided lights on every addition they have done in Town including houses on Culpeper Street, and if they are the right window and right manufacturer and you stand 40 feet away, no one is going to know the difference. Mr. Norden stated he would not say that if he did not believe it because there is some junk material out there but what he has used in the past has been true simulated divided lights with fixed muntins on the inside and outside with a spacer bar in between and no one can tell the difference.

Mr. Tucker stated that information was not on the plans and if it had been this discussion would not be necessary.

Mr. Norden stated that to him the language of simulated divided light means fixed muntins indoors and outdoors, and that is the language of the industry and he failed to clarify it on the plans.

Mr. Tucker stated that if an applicant comes before the Board for replacement of windows, the Board likes to see a sample.

Mr. Norden indicated the plan does specify the brand and that further clarification would be provided.

Mr. Wojcik asked what the size of the parking area was.

Mr. Norden stated it is approximately 36 feet across and is enough to park four cars.

Mr. Wojcik asked if it would be possible to make it 30 feet because he thought the big area of pavement would distract from the house.

Mr. Norden stated the parking spaces are 9 feet by 18 feet, which is typical and owner did not want cars blocking the entrance way to the house and wanted to save the magnolia trees.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the Board could recommend landscaping be done as a way to soften the effects of the large pavement area. She indicated the Board had made this recommendation before for the house on Fifth Street across from the Farmers Market.

Mr. Tucker stated that a three-foot wall could be added and make it a true parking court.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated a wall would obscure the view of the house.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Mr. Norden if she was correct, stating that the windows being used will be simulated divided lights with fixed muntins on interior and exterior with a spacer bar in between.

Mr. Norden stated yes.

Dr. Wiedenfeld made motion to approve the application for ARB 15-11 for the proposed single family dwelling at the corner of Culpeper Street and East Shirley Avenue with the following conditions.

1. Proportion, scale and massing are satisfactory to the Board
2. Construction materials are satisfactory to the Board in that the cupola roof is metal, the carriage style garage doors and decking will be wood, all doors are wood, all windows will be simulated divided light with fixed muntins on interior and exterior with a spacer bar in-between and an addition of some chimney detail will be included.
3. Building Permit is acquired.
4. Landscaping will be added to soften the effects of the large paved area in front of the house.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wojcik.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Wojcik asked if more detail should be included in the landscaping recommendation.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that if specific shrubs or plants are identified it could do more harm than good.

Mr. Tucker asked if the height of the shrubbery could be recommended.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she did not think that should be done because they could not know whether the plants will live.

Mr. Tucker stated that was why he suggested a wall.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that she thought the landscape motion was appropriate.

Mr. Tucker asked if staff would be determining what is appropriate. Not being specific allows anyone to determine what is appropriate.

Mr. Wojcik asked staff how far the Board could go with landscaping specifications.

Ms. Sitterle stated each case is handled individually on a case-by-case basis, however, in the past there has not been a detailed specifications on the type of plant or placement. For example, shrubs or some type of screening plant must be placed as a screen to soften the affects of air-conditioning units. Ms. Sitterle stated that the height or specifics are not identified.

Mr. Wojcik stated he wanted to make an amendment to modify the landscape condition to specify shrubbery be used to soften the impact of the parking area from both Shirley Avenue and Culpeper Street.

Dr. Hertz asked if height should be included.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she would not vote for that.

Mr. Tucker suggested wording that states a type that will achieve a height of at least 36 inches.

Mr. Tucker stated he agreed with Mr. Wojcik because it was not just the parking area but also the automobiles that will be parked there that need to be screened because they will be in front of the house, which is not consistent with Culpeper Street.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that the modification would read as follows:

Landscaping including shrubbery to soften the impact of the parking area from Shirley Avenue and Culpeper Street.

Dr. Wiedenfeld noted the motion had been seconded and a modification made. As result, she restated the motion to approve Certificate of Appropriateness 15-11 for the proposed single family dwelling at the corner of Culpeper Street and East Shirley Avenue with the following conditions.

1. Proportion, scale and massing are satisfactory to the Board as has been discussed
2. Construction materials are as follows what is on the plans and the cupola roof will be metal, garage door are of a carriage style and will be wood, decking will be wood, doors will be wood, chimney will have addition of small detail. Windows will be simulated divided light with muntins on the exterior and interior with spacer bar in-between.
3. Landscaping will be included, including shrubbery to soften the impact of the parking area on the street sides.

All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

Mr. Tucker stated that he thought Mr. Norden's presentation brought up many issues the Board needed to address.

Mr. Wood stated he was pleased that a single-family dwelling was being constructed and not a commercial building.

Work Session

Dr. Hertz suggested amending application procedure so applicants know what has to be submitted before they appear before the Board.

Mr. Tucker stated he agreed and that windows samples should be presented and in the past samples of materials were always required but today that is not the case. He stated for new construction such as this, the Board was left out of the site planning process that is tremendously important to the historic district but the Board's hands were tied. Mr. Tucker stated the dwelling presented was incorrectly sited. The Board should not be left out when there is new construction in the historic district. He suggested a pre-final design come before the ARB before a site plan is presented and before amendments for setbacks and other issues are addressed. ARB should be

involved at the beginning not at the end.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the Board could have disapproved it.

Mr. Tucker stated that was true but the Board could not make changes that had already been approved elsewhere. He stated he was not certain that members of the other boards have the same interest as the ARB does. The garage is what is being set back not the house and it is not like anything else on Culpeper Street. He suggested the Board work with Ms. Sitterle to have a two-stage presentation for new construction that comes before the ARB or before it goes to other boards.

Ms. Sitterle stated ARB has no input as it relates to zoning issues.

Mr. Tucker stated that was fine and the Board could accept it as it is and review the site and make recommendations and the applicant will know if it will be accepted before they go for setbacks or anything else.

Dr. Hertz stated that the Architectural Review Board should be first.

Mr. Tucker stated the location of the mass of this house was a big issue and the Board has missed opportunity. He stated this is a prominent corner in town and the site plan does not address the corner, Culpeper Street or Shirley Avenue and is wrong in so many ways.

Ms. Sitterle stated that single-family homes do not require a site plan and there was no formal site plan review. Staff has not seen a building plan and that this presentation is the first step of the process. As far as the Board of Zoning Appeals goes, they were seeking a variance to avoid taking down trees, and avoid encroaching on an existing egress and ingress access that joins an adjoining property. Ms. Sitterle stated these are issues for which the ARB does not have purview and she understood the Board's concern over the site. As far as any actions from the Board of Zoning Appeals, Ms. Sitterle stated that zoning still trumps the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Tucker stated the Board could have turned it down because it is a poor site and it would have gone back.

Ms. Sitterle stated the Board could have done that.

Mr. Tucker stated that makes the ARB look like the bad guys and what he wants is for the ARB to be involved in the early part of the process so the Board will not be looked at in that vein.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated garages are problems but this one will look like a detached garage, which is found in historic neighborhoods, and there are detached garages on Culpeper Street.

Dr. Hertz indicated that the Jackson home on Culpeper Street has a garage on the side that is connected to the house.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that parking courts are not that unusual with houses that are set back and they work with landscaping.

Mr. Wojcik asked if the Board could have been more specific about the parking area landscaping.

Mr. Turner stated the Board has been specific in the past for those situations where it is directly on the street such as Fifth Street but in this case, the parking is 40 feet back.

Mr. Wojcik asked if the Board could have recommended pea gravel for the parking area as opposed to cement or asphalt.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the applicant for Fifth Street was asked to come back and show the Board what was going to be done at their parking area and perhaps that would have been more appropriate for this applicant.

Dr. Hertz stated that if ARB rules are such that the applicant knows what to present it will certainly circumvent the continuous return of applicants.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Guidelines state the applicant should be prepared to present a description of all materials.

Dr. Hertz stated that the ARB Guidelines are concrete and should be provided to the applicants.

Mr. Tucker stated that the application should be revised and state that the applicant must include those items listed.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated staff could ask for more.

Mr. Tucker stated there is then the possibility of turning them down or making them come back.

Dr. Wiedenfeld indicated that Ms. Gibson brought the application by last week, and she could have requested at that time that Mr. Norden bring in certain things, such as photographs, samples, etc.

Mr. Tucker stated that puts the burden on the Board to review it, go back, and ask for more. That should not be the case because the checklist should go out beforehand as part of the application process.

Dr. Hertz indicated she agreed.

Mr. Tucker and Dr. Hertz both indicated they were not criticizing staff only recommending that they add more information to the application that informs the applicant to come to the ARB with specific information.

Ms. Sitterle stated she was having staff provide assistance with this and she apologized for not scrutinizing the application more carefully. She indicated the application does include a list of items the applicant is submitting with their application details such as photographs, drawings, etc.

Mr. Tucker stated this was presented as a developer's house that he plans to sell and move on, but that the Town has to accept it and as result, he felt Board is justified to ask for more information.

Mr. Wojcik noted that no discussion was held about the location of outside mechanical devices or air handlers.

Mr. Tucker indicated that was because it was left out.

Mr. Wood stated he asked about the deck because there are so many synthetic materials being used. He noted there was no discussion about the gutters.

Mr. Tucker asked Ms. Sitterle if the materials and items the Board is asking for are on the application and part of the application process.

Ms. Sitterle stated there is a list of information/materials that the applicant has to provide.

Mr. Tucker suggested that each of the Board members look at that list, and when an application comes before the Board it should be ready to say the application is incomplete and identify what is missing.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated she did not think it was a bad thing for the ARB to be the bad guy.

Mr. Tucker stated his perception of the public's perception of the ARB is that they are the obstacle. He asked Ms. Sitterle if he was correct.

Ms. Sitterle stated that perception goes way back and is not anything new.

Mr. Tucker stated he would like to erase that perception and have it as a place where the residents bring their projects with all the information so the ARB will not turn them down and be perceived as uncooperative by requesting they come back.

Mr. Tucker stated that he liked the ivy on the tree trunks because the house was not appropriate for the district and had many flaws at that prominent intersection. He indicated that the architects failed to address the corner and inappropriate mass for the house and it is not equal to anything on Culpeper Street. The house proposed is not a product of the era, 2015; it is a throwback to Greek revival and the Department of Interior Guidelines state that should not be done. The structure should look like a house of 2015. This is going to look like a plastic and cement board version of Greek style house and is not of this era.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated no one would mistake this as being old.

Mr. Tucker stated it waters down the character of the old and it does not look like anything else in the neighborhood.

Dr. Hertz asked if this happened because they went to the Board of Zoning Appeals first.

Ms. Sitterle stated that is what typically occurs and the applicant did not have the plans that they have now but they did not want to go through the process and spend money if zoning was not approved. Ms. Sitterle stated the applicant only got a revised front setback from Shirley Avenue.

Mr. Tucker stated ARB could have said this is not appropriate for this site.

Dr. Hertz stated she was confused about the BZA and their role.

Dr. Hertz made a motion to adjourn and Mr. Wojcik seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Minutes submitted by Dee Highnote.